

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
Mr. Joe McClane Speaker #1 PH 101308	President of Cambridge Walk HOA. Chair of TNPAG composed of Twinbrook residents; have worked on plan since April 2005. Proud of progressive forward-looking plan that has included unprecedented outreach to community for years and reflects the needs of our fellow citizens. Support this plan. Want mixed use. Support closing the record.	
Mr. Peter Mork Speaker #2 PH 101308	Resident of the Burgundy Estates area. Original concerns about long-term growth and development have been addressed in the Draft Plan. The proposed zoning would be equivalent [to the current zoning] in terms of the use of the space and of traffic and parking, except that it would allow residential as well as commercial uses. There are restrictions on the use based on the parking available. New plan an improvement over what is currently allowed there. We should accept the plan and move on.	Proposed zone for Burgundy Center: MXC – amended to allow Dwellings, multiple-unit, as a Conditional Use. (Ch. 4)
Ms. Virginia Quesada Speaker #3 PH 101308	Concerned about the effect of change on diversity. Not hearing discussion about infrastructure, more subways, widening roads. Where is concern about more density?	Acknowledges increasing diversity in the area. (Ch. 1)
Mr. Doug Hernan Speaker #5 PH 101308	Fifteen-year resident of Twinbrook. Plan represents forward thinking. More thought on Lewis Avenue/Halpine area. Stronger language about 5946 Halpine Road; not the worst neighbors, but do not belong in the neighborhood. More residential for Lewis Ave. Would like to see more of an “L” of townhouses. More park space per resident needed: National groups call for 10 acres per 1000 people; now have 3.8 acres per 1000 people. More bike and pedestrian overpasses needed between Twinbrook Metro Station and Edmonston.	Proposed zone for the Lewis Avenue industrial area is I-L, which is intended to allow the existing businesses to remain. Recommends I-L be amended to allow Dwellings, multiple-unit, as a Conditional Use. (Ch. 4) Plan recommends maintenance of the R-60 zone for 5946 Halpine Road – for single family housing on the site if it is developed,

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
		or acquire the site for additional park and green space, should it become available. Plan recommends the Mayor and Council should explore ways to eliminate the existing non-conforming use and convert it to parkland or single-family residential use. (Ch. 4)
Ms. Cynthia Hernan Speaker #6 PH 101308	Fifteen-year resident of Twinbrook. Support plan – really extremely strong plan. Support measures to get people out of cars – rapid transit, completing sidewalks. Supports development for Veirs Mill Road. Lewis Avenue should have more green space as opposed to light industrial. Taylor Property is nonconforming; should be made green space. Increase oversight to property maintenance; issue citations for maintenance. Property values will increase with plan.	See Speaker #5 above.
Mr. Tony Treston Speaker #7 PH 101308	Addressed Burgundy Village Shopping Center: changing zoning to mixed use allows apartments amongst single-family homes near Burgundy Estates Shopping Center. Original plan called for shopping center to be within current zoning. Should be no more than 30 feet high, includes no more than two stories, maximum floor area ratio, etc. Center needs traffic aide to get in and out. History says present zoning should be maintained. No apparent support for change other than more housing is needed in Twinbrook. No warning that zoning would change.	Proposed zone for Burgundy Center: MXC – amended to allow Dwellings, multiple-unit, as a Conditional Use. (Ch. 4)
Mr. William Neil Speaker #8 PH 101308	Lives in Twinbrook. Plan was developed under old world assumptions: the new world indicates that economic climate does not warrant building new developments. Unless there's a compelling reason to build, this model will not work.	Plan recommends zoning changes – it is not a development proposal. (Ch. 4)

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
	Twinbrook is last place the plan will work. Did not know about Taylor property and missed controversy regarding it.	
Ms. Judy Miller Speaker #9 PH 101308	Was a member of the Twinbrook Advisory Group and is vice-president of TCA. Draft should have been beginning, not end. Plan creates more people, congestion, traffic and problems. Plan has been controversial from the beginning. TCA worked with City to put on two informational meetings. Constantly heard concerns about the levels of development in Twinbrook. Under guise of smart growth and being pedestrian friendly, citizens learned that usually means more people, traffic, and more problems in the neighborhood. Council should carefully review and change Twinbrook plan for responsible development and fiscal policy for our city. Would like to see the Taylor property zoned for townhouses.	Plan recommends maintenance of the R-60 zone for 5946 Halpine Road – for single family housing on the site if it is developed, or acquire the site for additional park and green space, should it become available. Plan recommends the Mayor and Council should explore ways to eliminate the existing non-conforming use and convert it to parkland or single-family residential use. (Ch. 4)
Mr. Kevin Gallagher Speaker #10 PH 101308	Lives on Highwood road. Project is heralded as having outreach, great expense. Taylor property is nonconforming. Believes Ms. Pakulniewicz-Chidiac was self-serving in lobbying against the Taylor property, encouraging stronger language in the plan for the rezoning in a way that the owner would lose the use of the property that has been satisfactory for the last 35 years.	See # 9 above.
Ms. Barbara Grewe Speaker #11 PH 101308	Past president of Burgundy States Civic Association, resident for 35 years. Concern is condition of shopping center. Opposes apartments that result in additional traffic.	Proposed zone for Burgundy Center: MXC – amended to allow Dwellings, multiple-unit, as a Conditional Use. (Ch. 4)
Mr. Paul Wolfe Speaker #12 PH 101308	Twenty-eight year resident of Rockville, 13 years spent in Twinbrook. Small business owner operating out of condominiums on Lewis Avenue. Companies will be excluded from the current plan. As the plan stands, no businesses would remain in the condominiums. The businesses service a lot of	Proposed zone for the Lewis Avenue industrial area is I-L, which allows Light and Service Industrial uses, and is intended to allow the existing businesses to remain. (Ch. 4)

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
	Rockville residents. No transparency in planning; concern over effect of all small businesses.	
Mr. Dan Chwirut Speaker #13 PH 101308	Lived on Woodburn Road for the last 35 years. Big problem is traffic. Against mixed use. Good idea to get people out of cars, but it will not work: too much through traffic. Against mixed use, especially at Burgundy, but also the Twinbrook Shopping Center - change will bring more people and more problems into the neighborhood. Not a big proponent of eminent domain. Any change to improve traffic will take property from Burgundy Shopping Center.	Proposed zone for Burgundy Center: MXC – amended to allow Dwellings, multiple-unit, as a Conditional Use. (Ch. 4) Baltimore Road improvement project is underway. (Ch. 5) Plan does not recommend the use of eminent domain.
Ms. Naomi Belkin Speaker #14 PH 101308	President of the Twinbrook Mart Condominium Association. Site can only be redeveloped in an upward direction. Hesitates to approve zoning.	Plan recommends MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.)
Ms. Anabel Safire Speaker #15 PH 101308	Need to be able to park in front of their homes. Very little disabled parking in Rockville; need a plan for parking.	Plan includes recommendations on parking. (Ch. 5)
Mr. David Greene Speaker #16 PH 101308	Lives on Bradley Avenue. Opposes mixed use, especially for Burgundy Estates. Need better way to get over railroad tracks. Crossing the tracks at Twinbrook Parkway is near a horrible intersection. All intersections where tracks exist are bad. No mention of tracks in Plan. Twinbrook Station is going to make crossing tracks much more difficult than it is now.	Montgomery County's proposed Montrose Parkway East will offer an alternative to Twinbrook Parkway for east-west through traffic. Plan recommends study of the feasibility of an additional pedestrian crossing across the tracks at Halpine Road, or another location. Twinbrook Station will improve the cross track links - includes a pedestrian link expected to be open 24-7. (Ch. 5)

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
Ms. Linda Bozzonetti Speaker #17 PH 101308	Member of the Advisory Committee; supports draft plan, and Planning Commission improved it. Would very much like to have good public transportation.	Plan recommends increased transit. (Ch. 5)
Ms. Jennifer Hicks Speaker #18 PH 101308	Lives on Midway Avenue. Came because received letter from TCA that questioned whether they would lose the value of their home because of the plan. There's a light at Broadwood, but a crosswalk is needed because of the distance walked to get to the nearest light.	
Mr. Phil Gerkin Speaker #19 PH 101308	Twinbrook resident since 1969. Saw the previous Town Center, when he sees what's happening to the center of the City he wonders if it is really going or not. Has talked with a business owner who said one of the new restaurants was going bankrupt. Thinks caution should be taken before moving forward. Concerned that new plan is rushing forward; Twinbrook Center is not meant for high income residents. The new plan is meant to serve the wrong people.	Plan recommends zoning changes – it is not a development proposal. (Ch. 4) Veirs Mill Road commercial area recommended for rezone to MXNC with maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.)
Ms. Christina Ginsberg Speaker #21 PH 101308	Lives on Simmons Drive and is President of Twinbrook Citizens' Association. Floating zones should not be recommended; dangerous for Twinbrook and the rest of City. Asked Advisory Group that floating zones be removed. TCA voted twice to remove floating zones. They are dangerous for Twinbrook and the rest of the community. No one wants 1365 cars more to be added to Twinbrook Parkway and Veirs Mill Road. No statement that Lewis Avenue should not be cut through to Twinbrook Stations. Statements are needed in plan to direct our future. This is not the plan for Twinbrook.	Plan does not recommend floating zones – they are discussed as a tool that could be available. (Ch. 2) Veirs Mill Road commercial area is recommended for MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.) Number of cars stated emerged from a

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
		<p>zoning study that showed that City's then parking standards would yield 1365 spaces: aided in discussion (and amendment) of City's parking standards as part of the Zoning Ordinance revision.</p> <p>Plan recommends improved transit for the area. (Ch. 5)</p>
Mr. Donald Beck Speaker #22 PH 101308	Has lived on Ridgeway Avenue for 38 years. Walks to shopping and to metro station. Concerned about redevelopment and that Town Center has not met expectations; do not want to disturb the equilibrium in Twinbrook.	<p>Plan recommends zoning changes – it is not a development proposal. (Ch. 4)</p> <p>Twinbrook Station development is under construction.</p>
Ms. Aly Dejesus Speaker #24 PH 101308	Lived on McAuliffe Drive for 20 years. Received letter from TCA, very concerned and brought a lot of family and friends to hearing. Are high rises really necessary on that site? Really consider the chaos that will be created during redevelopment and rethink the impact on Twinbrook.	<p>Plan recommendation for Veirs Mill Road commercial areas is MXNC with a maximum height of 65 feet. Layback slope of 30 degrees from a single-family zone means that any development on McAuliffe might not be substantially higher than that allowed in the R-60 zone. (Ch. 4)</p> <p>(C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.)</p>
Ms. Patti Sullivan-Sten Speaker #25 PH 101308	Lives on Grandin Avenue. Not a member of TCA, although did receive the TCA letter. Against changing zoning at Burgundy Estates for mixed use. Does not think apartments and retail belong in the area. Wants more consideration for the parking and traffic and bike zones.	<p>Proposed zone for Burgundy Center: MXC – amended to allow Dwellings, multiple-unit, as a Conditional Use. (Ch. 4)</p>

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
Andy Harper 09/27/08 Written #2	32-year resident of Urbana who was raised in Twinbrook and lived here as a younger man. Retains fond memories of Twinbrook and does not wish to see any change.	
Naomi Belkin 10/10/08 Written #3	Co-owner at Twinbrook Mart – a condominium of small business owners whose property is their major asset. Object to anything below the currently allowed 75-foot height. Have 20 years of investment and believe strict limits on any future development would devalue the property. Shopping center on major highway and pays substantial taxes – restricting the zoning would restrict the taxes. We are doing our best to provide for our community and want to be able to plan a shopping center that would add value.	Plan recommends MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.)
Rob Perks 10/13/08 Written #4	Twinbrook homeowner since 1997. Support Twinbrook Station but concerned about increased traffic and overcrowded schools, improving and expanding community services and increasing recreational parks. Supportive of alternative vision for neighborhood put forth by the Twinbrook Citizens Association.	
Marcia and Edward Daoud 10/13/08 Written #5	Want neighborhood to remain mostly residential with single-family homes. Concerned about traffic. Want to keep existing green space. Prefer Twinbrook shopping centers remain shorter and library retained.	Plan recommends MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.) Montgomery County owns and operates Library.
Patricia L. Campbell 10/13/08	Twinbrook resident since 1952. Grew up on Ardennes Avenue. Twinbrook residents have been the backbone of Rockville for many years and we may be treated as second-	

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
Written #6	<p>rate. Adding zones that do not match with the rest of the City. Might try to look for new ways/methods to seize private property Plan for high density building on land backing up to parkland No plans in plan to keep Twinbrook Library open Should not be a major bus depot area Where are the traffic studies? Infrastructure studies?</p>	<p>All proposed zones are part of the City-wide Zoning Ordinance. Montgomery County owns and operates the Library. The plan does not recommend a bus depot.</p>
<p>Anna and Biagio Colandreo</p> <p>10/12/08</p> <p>Written #7</p>	<p>Read TCAs recommendation for Twinbrook and strongly agree with each recommendation. Love the shopping center, which is convenient for us. Needs updating but not more density or more traffic. Fearful area may turn into low income housing area. Do not want anything done that will reduce our property values. Do not want a transit center in area. Have more than enough traffic.</p>	<p>See Written #6 above.</p>
<p>Mahyar</p> <p>10/13/08</p> <p>Written #8</p>	<p>Co-owner of Twinbrook Mart condominium. Allowable height has a direct impact on the development incentives for any investor/developer. Minimum height of 12 feet per floor required. Current condominium property owners would need to agree to collectively sell to an investor for any new development to occur – key factor would be purchase price, which is dependent on an acceptable return on investment, which is dependent on the zoning. Requests minimum of 72 feet. Although mixed use is great numbers have to justify the development plan and project design.</p>	<p>Plan recommends MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.)</p>

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
<p>Daria and Andrew Pogan</p> <p>10/13/08</p> <p>Written #9</p>	<p>Rockville residents since 1976, Twinbrook since 1990. Opposed to the TNP. Not in need of a mixed-use development like the ones that sit unoccupied in Rockville civic center. Where are the plans for the library? How has the impact on schools been taken into consideration? Endured the effects of City planning on the City center. Twinbrook home to a wide mix of multi-cultural, working class people. Have no interest in upscale mixed use such as Congressional and Rockville Town Center. Please listen to the desires of the citizens of our neighborhood.</p>	<p>Plan recommends zoning changes – it is not a development proposal. (Ch. 4)</p>
<p>Tony Treston</p> <p>10/02/08</p> <p>Written #11</p>	<p>Does not agree with PC Draft TNP recommendation of MXC for Burgundy Shopping Center – would prefer to return to previous recommendation of a C-zone.</p>	<p>Plan recommends MXC – amended to allow Dwellings, multiple-unit, as a Conditional Use.</p>
<p>Sherry Harris</p> <p>08/31/08</p> <p>Written #12</p>	<p>Think the new ideas for Twinbrook Center is great. Wish they would approve it and start on it right away. Have lived in Twinbrook for 20 years and this is the smartest thing suggested.</p>	<p>Plan recommends MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.)</p>
<p>Yann Henrotte</p> <p>10/13/08</p> <p>Written #13</p>	<p>Concerned about:</p> <p>The approved heights on the Veirs Mill commercial areas are almost twice as tall as permitted for houses.</p> <p>Adding zones that do not match with the rest of the City.</p> <p>Might try to look for new ways/methods to seize private property</p> <p>Plan for high density building on land backing up to parkland.</p> <p>No plans in plan to keep Twinbrook Library open.</p> <p>Should not be a major bus depot area.</p> <p>Where are the traffic studies? Infrastructure studies?</p>	<p>Plan recommends MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.)</p> <p>See above.</p>

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
K. Joy King 10/13/08 Written #14	Concerned about traffic on Twinbrook Parkway and Veirs Mill Road, particular difficulty for pedestrians crossing.	Plan recommends improvements (Ch. 5). Improvements also scheduled as part of Twinbrook Station project.
J. De Angelis 10/13/08 Written #15	Concerned about traffic, particularly on Twinbrook Parkway, Veirs Mill Road and First Street/Route 28. Against increased density – supports TCA recommendations. Already development along Twinbrook Parkway and at the metro station. Should be a moratorium on building any new structures in Twinbrook other than single family homes unless there are improvements in traffic. Need a clear plan for moving people safely in environmentally friendly ways.	Plan recommends zoning changes – it is not a development proposal. (Ch. 4) Plan recommends soft-wheel clock-wise and anti-clock wise circulator trolley. (Ch. 5)
Yatin and Arati Bhatt 10/13/08 Written #16	Concerned about: Approving heights at Veirs Mill commercial areas that are almost twice as tall as permitted for houses. New mixed-use zones that will add residential units in commercial areas. What will 1595 apartments at Twinbrook Metro station do to our school capacity? With the 1595 apartments at Twinbrook Metro and 1000-2600 in the County's Twinbrook Sector Twinbrook Parkway will be undriveable.	Plan recommends MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 allowed 75 feet.)
Judy Miller 10/13/08 Written #17	Member of TNPAG and Vice President of TCA. Disagree with the Plan – constantly heard concerns about the level of development in the plan – means more, people, congestion, traffic and problems in the neighborhood. Planning Commission's version adds even more mixed use. Mixed use can be a good thing in the right proportion and in	Plan recommends zoning changes – it is not a development proposal. (Ch. 4)

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
	the right areas but can lead to a glut of apartments and commercial property. Recent catastrophe in the financial markets shows that the market place does not always regulate itself for the good of all. Ask for review and change to the plan to provide responsible development and fiscal policy for our City.	
Linda Nasvaderani 10/15/08 Written #18	Twinbrook resident for more than 30 years – Twinbrook has constantly improved. Concerned about push for excess development in Twinbrook area especially in light of the current economy. Would like to see improvement and greater security at the Veirs Mill Road shopping area, but do not approve of 6-story buildings. Too much traffic – real traffic studies must be done. Who will live at Twinbrook Station? Lack of purchases has turned Town Square into rental units. Lewis Avenue should not be an alternate route to the Twinbrook Metro. Concerned about lack of trees on Veirs Mill Road and in the commercial areas.	Plan recommends zoning changes – it is not a development proposal. Plan recommends MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.) There are no plans to open Lewis Avenue.
Bob Taylor 10/14/08 Written #19	Thirty year resident of Twinbrook. Lot of change in the City but Twinbrook has remained one of the steadfast rocks. Any new regulations should apply to the entire City and not just to Twinbrook. Do not approve of plan, especially transit center in Twinbrook. Do not approve of proposals for shopping center. Do not approve of opening Lewis Avenue to Twinbrook Commons. Concerned about traffic on Edmonston and Veirs Mill Road.	Plan recommends MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allows 75 feet.) See above.

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
Pilar Romero 10/19/08 Written #21	Resident of Twinbrook area. Don't agree with the housing plan in the shopping center – already have parking problems and car accidents every week. Occasional see small groups of teenagers smoking and trash on the floor. Population growing and our needs too – good idea to renovate and add one or two more floors to the shopping center for more services and businesses.	Plan recommends MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.)
Lilliam Isaac Undated Written #22	Strongly concur with the TCA concerns and recommendations. Concerned about traffic congestion.	
Barbara Sears, Linowes and Blocher, on behalf of AvalonBay Co. 10/24/08 Written #23	Property owner supports recommendations for the Property at Twinbrook Parkway made in the June 6, 2008 draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan that was approved by the Planning Commission on June 11, 2008.	Plan recommends MXB zone. (Ch. 4)
Corinne and David Garber 10/26/08 Written #24	Against modifying Veirs Mill Road for Bus Rapid Transit, especially if that would encroach on the service roads.	Plan recommends that any transit improvement on Veirs Mill Road should be made within the existing right of way and should not increase neighborhood cut-through traffic. (Ch. 5)
Madonna Grimmer 10/22/08 Written #25	Remember former town center that was a failure and had to be torn down. How long will new Town Center survive? Too many apartments are being built – where will all the cars go? Concerned about traffic impacts, criminal activity, metro	Plan recommends zoning changes – it is not a development proposal. (Ch. 4) See above.

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
	<p>capacity. Believes a community is composed of single family homes with green areas and nearby places of worship. Has a mall within walking distance that contains the essentials to allow older people to remain in their homes. The present center used to have more stores: hardware, shoes, dress store – have to drive to buy those things now. Already have a bus between two Metro stops and seniors can ride free, but there are few people in the middle of the day. Why hurry? Why not put plans on hold and see what develops with the Twinbrook metro plan.</p>	
<p>Janet Green and Donna Grimmer</p> <p>10/22/08 Written #26</p>	<p>Remember former town center that was a failure and had to be torn down. How long will new Town Center survive? Too many apartments are being built – where will all the cars go? Concerned about traffic impacts, criminal activity, metro capacity. Believes a community is composed of single family homes with green areas and nearby places of worship. Has a mall within walking distance that contains the essentials to allow older people to remain in their homes. The present center used to have more stores: hardware, shoes, dress store – have to drive to buy those things now. Already have a bus between two Metro stops and seniors can ride free, but there are few people in the middle of the day. Why hurry? Why not put plans on hold and see what develops with the Twinbrook metro plan</p>	<p>See above.</p>

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
<p>David Greene</p> <p>10/31/08</p> <p>Written #27</p>	<p>Spoke at public hearing.</p> <p>Plan does not address the problem of east-west traffic flow, which is restricted by the few existing railroad crossings. Proposed zoning allows mixed-use development and plan proposes north-south rotator buses to minimize additional traffic.</p>	<p>Montgomery County's proposed Montrose Parkway East will offer an alternative to Twinbrook Parkway for east-west through traffic.</p> <p>Plan recommends soft-wheel clock-wise and anti-clockwise circulator trolley. (Ch.5)</p>
<p>Scott C. Wallace, Linowes and Blocker, on behalf of Twinbrook Shopping Center Joint Venture</p> <p>10/31/08</p> <p>Written #28</p>	<p>Because the owners of the Shopping Center (Twinbrook Joint Venture) have no development plans in the near term, it is essential that any design recommendations for the redevelopment of the Shopping Center be flexible enough to allow the Twinbrook JV to respond to market conditions, and planning objectives, as they evolve in the future.</p> <p>Concerned about plan recommendation regarding Atlantic Avenue and suggest amended language:</p> <p>“If the Shopping Center redevelops, then the extension of Atlantic Avenue through the Shopping Center to McAuliffe Drive should be studied to determine if the extension will improve traffic circulation in the surrounding community and if the extension can be designed to be compatible with the proposed redevelopment.”</p> <p>There are a number of valuable long-term leases on the property – any redevelopment would require significant economic incentive. Believe that building heights of at least 75 feet would be required to allow for mid-rise buildings with 5 floors over 1 floor of retail.</p>	<p>Plan recommends MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.)</p>

Planning Commission Draft of the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan
Summary of Testimony Received on Land Use, Current Non-Residential Areas and Transportation Issues

Name	Testimony	Plan Recommendation
Brandon Addison 10/13/08 Written #29	Concerned about development plan that is proposed for the Twinbrook community. Concerned about height of office buildings, use of eminent domain to seize single-family homes for economic development, the future of the Twinbrook library.	Plan recommends MXNC zone with a maximum height of 65 feet. (Layback slope of 30 degrees.) (Ch. 4) (C-2 zone allowed 75 feet.) The plan does not recommend the use of eminent domain.